

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action mailed November 20, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1-17 were pending, that claim 17 have been withdrawn from consideration, and rejected claims 1-4 and 8-16, and objected to claims 5-7. Claims 1, 5, 8, 12 and 16 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, new claim 18 has been added; and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-18 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter is believed to have been added. The Examiner's rejections and objections are respectfully traversed below.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

At item 5 on page 2 of the Office Action, claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 16 has been amended to recite an "apparatus" which falls under the statutory class of a machine. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 16 satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

At item 9 on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 8-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nielsen (Designing Web Usability).

According to Nielsen, due to bandwidth constraints, use of video should currently be minimized on the Web (see page 1, first paragraph). Nielsen describes that a major problem with most videos on the web right now is that their production values are much too low (see page 2, third paragraph). Therefore, spoken words are sometimes harder to understand, especially if the speaker is sloppy, has a dialect, speaks over a distracting soundtrack, or simply speaks to quickly. Accordingly to Nielsen, the classic solution to these problems is to use subtitles.

In claim 1, however, "input multimedia oriented to a personal computer to be displayed on a screen ... with a predetermined size" is converted "*into* output multimedia contents oriented to a portable terminal to be displayed on a screen ... with a size smaller than said predetermined size". Nielsen does not disclose such a feature since Nielsen describes resizing video subtitles into the web page so that the subtitles are virtually readable when the size of the video with subtitles is reduced. Particularly, Nielsen describes that traditional subtitles look good on a full-sized videotape but are virtually unreadable when the video is reduced to the size usually transmitted over the Internet (see page 2, paragraph 2). To enhance viewing, Nielsen describes that better readability is gained from placing the subtitles in a letterbox and sizing them for

computer viewing. As such, Nielsen does not teach or suggest such a converting feature as recited in claim 1.

Further, Nielsen describes that in order to preserve a feeling of user control, break programs of longer presentations into short chapters that can be chosen from a menu on a website (see page 2, paragraph 3). Particularly, when converting a news program on the web, break the program into one segment for each news story. As a result, the feeling of user control is preserved. In claim 1, however, "input multimedia oriented to a personal computer" is converted "*into* output multimedia contents oriented to a portable terminal". Nielsen does not teach or suggest such a converting feature since Nielsen is merely concerned with enhancing the readability of subtitles by resizing the subtitles and preserving the sense of user control by breaking a program into segments.

Therefore, Nielsen does not disclose or suggest how to convert input multimedia oriented to a personal computer ... into output multimedia contents oriented to a portable terminal. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Nielsen.

Claims 8, 12 and 16 have been amended to emphasize similar features as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, claims 8, 12 and 16 are patentable over Nielsen for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Further, the dependent claims 4, 9-11 and 13-15 are also patentable over Nielsen for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

#### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

At item 15 on page 6 of the Office Action, claims 4, 11 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen in view of Oliver et al. (Sams Teach Yourself HTML and XHTML).

The dependent claims 4, 11 and 15 are patentable over Nielsen for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims 1, 8 and 12. Further, nothing was found or cited in Oliver et al. that cures the deficiencies of Nielsen as set forth above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claims 4, 11 and 15 are patentable over Nielsen and Oliver et al., taken alone or in combination thereof. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

### **New Claim**

New claim 18 has been added to recite:

18. (New) A method, comprising:  
    setting a playing time period of audio and video media in consideration  
    with a calculated display time period of a text media as playing time information;  
    and  
    converting multimedia configured to be displayed on a screen of a  
    personal computer into multimedia configured to be displayed on a screen of a  
    portable device based on the playing time information.

It is respectfully submitted that neither reference, taken alone or in combination thereof, teach or suggest the patentable features of new claim 18. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that new claim 18 is patentable over the references.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

At item 21 on page 9 of the Office Action, claims 5-7 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 5 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of base claim 1 and the intervening claim 4. Therefore, claim 5, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Further, dependent claims 6-7 are also in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as their base claim 5. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

### **Summary**

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/774,630

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 20, 2008

By: /Sheetal S. Patel/  
Sheetal S. Patel  
Registration No. 59,326

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501